

**Remarks/Arguments**

In the Election Requirement dated January 18, 2007, the Examiner required election between the following embodiments were present in the application:

1. Figures 4-5;
2. Figure 6;
3. Figure 7;
4. Figure 8;
5. Figure 9;
6. Figure 10;
7. Figure 11;
8. Figure 12;
9. Figure 13;
10. Figure 14;
11. Figure 15;
12. Figure 16;
13. Figure 17; and
14. Figure 18.

In view of the fourteen embodiments indicated by the Examiner, the Examiner has required applicant to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Also, the Examiner requires applicant to identify all of the claims readable on the elected species or embodiment.

In response to the Examiner's requirement to elect a species for further prosecution, applicant hereby provisionally elects the species identified as Embodiment 1, illustrated by Figures 4-5 for further prosecution, with traverse. Upon review of the claims of the application, applicant believes that Claims 1-34 read on the species in Embodiment 1.

This response provisionally elects the first embodiment illustrated by Figures 4 through 5. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that traverse is proper because the claims should be examined together, in light of all disclosed embodiments. More specifically, the remaining embodiments are not materially different from the first embodiment. For instance, all of the claims are classified within the same class and subclass, and read on each of the claims recited. Further, there are eight disclosed embodiments, rather than the fourteen cited by the Examiner. Thus, it is believed that traverse is proper and examination of all of the claims and embodiments is respectfully requested.

The election requirement is improper because all of the claims for the first embodiment can be examined without undue burden. First, the claims of each of these groups are closely defined such that they are classified in the very same class and subclass namely, class 384 and subclass 187. Second, the Examiner already must search the same limitations in these claims, since all read on the First Embodiment.

Further, the claims do not read on solely any particular embodiment. Therefore, it is believed that traverse is proper and examination of all of the claims in light of all of the embodiments is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/516,574  
Response to Election Requirement dated March 26, 2007  
Reply to Election Requirement of January 18, 2007

In light of the foregoing, Applicants request that the election requirement be withdrawn in its entirety and that all presently pending claims be considered.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the attending to of which would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

An extension of two-months is hereby requested, along with \$225.00 that is submitted with this communication. Moreover, the Director is authorized to direct any additional fees associated with this or any other communication, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 50-1170.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy E. Newholm  
Registration No. 34,400

Dated: March 26, 2007

USPTO Customer No. 23,598  
Boyle, Fredrickson, Newholm,  
Stein & Gratz, S.C.  
250 Plaza Building, Suite 1030  
250 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
Telephone: (414) 225-9755  
Facsimile: (414) 225-9753  
Email: [ten@boylefred.com](mailto:ten@boylefred.com)